

札幌大学総合論叢 第37号 (2014年3月)

〈論文〉

## Hume's treatment of the compound and mixed passions in the *Treatise*

Haruko Inoue

### Abstract

One might wonder if Hume's treatment of the "compound" or "mixed" passions in the *Treatise* has anything which merits much discussion.<sup>1</sup> Or, one might even ask, do the compound or mixed passions discussed by Hume have any important bearing on his system in the *Treatise*? To this I answer that Hume discusses a definite number of passions as the compound or mixed passions, by drawing not only the particular passions but also the method of analysis from the contemporary or earlier accounts of typology, and employs as much as five sections in Part 2 and one in Part 3 of Book II of the *Treatise* for the examination of them. In T2.2.7-11, he discusses "the compound passions which proceed from a mixture of love and hatred with other affections"(T2.2.11.1; SBN 394), viz. pity, malice, envy, respect, contempt, the amorous passion, and in T2.3.9-10, those which are a mixture of the contrary or adverse direct passions, viz. hope and fear.

It is evident that, although Hume assimilates a lot from the earlier accounts of typology, his concern in his treatment of these passions is not with the taxonomy of the passions. What then could be the reason for Hume to discuss these compound passions in the last stages of his discussion of the indirect and the direct passions? Hume's discussion of the origin of these particular passions is quite "resourceful" by itself as Laird observes,<sup>2</sup> but the point I highlight in this paper is that his treatment of

---

<sup>1</sup> This is Rachel Cohon's first reaction to this topic, which she expressed in our private conversation at Hume Conference in Calgary 2012.

<sup>2</sup> John Laird, *Hume's Philosophy of Human Nature*, Archon Books, 1967, p.200.

these passions demonstrates the unity of his system. The production of pity and malice functions, for instance, as the illustration of the conjunction between the two kinds of passions, indirect and direct; the production of hope and fear may well be taken to be a proof of a close union between the imagination and affections. It would indeed be not surprising if, upon entering into a new subject, Hume wanted to show the connection between his foregoing discussion on the indirect passions with his succeeding discussion on the direct. For, on his account, the two kinds of passions are different not only in their origin but also in their function. Or, nothing would be more natural for Hume than to intend to show in the last sections of Book II how the system of the passions is connected with the system of ideas which he has established in Book I. For, he has announced in the Advertisement that his intention is Books I and II is to show “The subject of the Understanding and Passions make a complete chain of reasoning by themselves”. If Hume’s treatment of the compound and mixed passions demonstrates the unity of his system, we can here see how he successfully “re-casts”, or “subverts”, what he has assimilated from previous account of the passions “in a significantly different form”.<sup>3</sup>

## 1 Introduction

In the opening section of Book II of the *Treatise*, Hume divides the passions into direct and indirect, and claims that the direct passions are “such as arise immediately from good or evil, from pain or pleasure”, whereas “the indirect, such as proceed from the same principles, but by the conjunction of other qualities” (T2.1.1.4; SBN 276). As the indirect passions he enumerates “pride, humility, ambition, vanity, love, hatred, envy, pity, malice, generosity, with their dependents”, whereas as the direct, “desire, aversion, grief, joy, hope, fear, despair, and security” (ibid.). This distinction between direct and indirect is definite and absolute as they are distinguished not only by their

---

<sup>3</sup> Jane McIntyre, “Hume’s ‘new and Extraordinary’ account of the passions”, *The Blackwell Guide to Hume’s Treatise*, ed. by Saul Traiger, Blackwell Publishing, 2006, p.208.

property but also by their origin.<sup>4</sup> On the basis of this division, Hume divides Book II of the *Treatise* into three parts, and employs the first two parts for the discussion of the indirect passions, viz. pride/humility, love/hatred, and the last for the account of “the will and direct passions”.<sup>5</sup> The compound or mixed passions are discussed both in Part 2 and in Part 3, both in the last stages of his treatments of the indirect and the direct passions at T2.2.7-11 and T2.3.9 respectively.

In the first place, Hume discusses “the compound passions which proceed from a mixture of love and hatred with other affections”, viz. pity, malice, envy, respect, contempt, the amorous passion (T2.2.11.1; SBN 394), and in the second, hope and fear, in terms of a mixture of the contrary or adverse direct passions. Although Hume uses the expressions “compound” and “mix” interchangeably, I shall call the first kind the *compound* passions and the second the *mixed* ones in the rest of this paper.<sup>6</sup>

One might suspect, however, that Hume had no definite intention to bracket these

---

<sup>4</sup> Unlike the direct ones, the indirect “passions are determin’d to have self [or the other self] as their object, not by a natural but also by an original property” (T2.1.3.2; SBN 280). Although “tis by means of a transition arising from a double relation of impressions and ideas, pride and humility, love and hatred are produced” (T2.2.2.28; SBN 347), the production of direct passions do not presuppose a double association of impressions and ideas, as they “frequently arise from a natural impulse or instinct” T2.3.9.8; SBN 439).

<sup>5</sup> As we see later, this distinction of direct and indirect is fundamental to Hume’s system in the sense that they are intended by him to function differently: the first kind motivating whereas the second pure emotions of the mind without directions. In the thought Kemp Smith tells us that “the distinction between the indirect and the direct passions is not fundamental” (Norman Kemp Smith, *The Philosophy of David Hume*, Palgrave MacMillan, 2005, NY, p.143).

<sup>6</sup> Hume uses “compound” and “mix” and other similar expressions interchangeably, though Hume seems to use “compound” for the union of different kinds of ingredients, and remarks, for instance, that “the object is not a compound of good or evil” (T2.3.9.16; SBN 442), whereas “mix” as an expression for the blending of the same kind of ingredients with different features or characters by observing that “hope and fear arise from the different mixture of these opposite passions of grief or joy” (T2.3.9.16; SBN 443). Historically, though these two expressions have been used in general interchangeably in literature on the passions, Hutcheson seems to employ them differently: by the former he means those of a mixed nature, which contain something adverse and something prosperous in their different circumstances, whereas by the latter, those which contain varieties of the same kind, viz. several Goods, at once. By a mixed object, Hutcheson means “what contains at once the Powers of Good and Evil”, and by a compound good or evil “such as contains the powers of several good and evils at once” (ibid. p.36). Hume seems to follow Hutcheson in this respect to some extent.

passions together as the compound or mixed passions in the *Treatise*. This indeed is a natural reaction in so far as we assume Hume's account of these passions is meant to explain the variables of those primary passions of love and hatred,<sup>7</sup> or the derivatives of joy and sorrow. Since Hume has drawn the particular passions and their surrounding circumstances from the earlier accounts on typology or taxonomy of the passions,<sup>8</sup> nothing would be more natural for us than to suppose that Hume's account of the compound and the mixed passions was made on the basis of the implication which had been sustained by previous philosophers. Especially in seventeenth and eighteenth century England, typology was flourishing, and many writers were fascinated by the classification of passions by appealing to a distinction between basic and derived, or primitive and mixed passions, in terms of the "compound" or "mixed" passions.<sup>9</sup> It is known that Descartes, Hobbes, Spinoza, Locke, Hutcheson, Malebranche, and many others, attempted to establish a typology by discussing how

---

<sup>7</sup> David Norton writes, for instance: "Some passions are formed of a mixture of other, simpler passions; these Hume calls the compound passions. His account of them focuses principally on three pairs of contrary passions, benevolence and anger, respect and contempt, pity and malice, as well as on envy, and love between the sexes. We can usefully begin with Hume's descriptions of these eight passions. Then we will need to look at several variables—factors that play at most a small part in the arousal of pride, humility, love and hatred, but which have a substantial and determining influence on the compound passions" (Introduction to David Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, David F. Norton and Mary I. Norton (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002, p.160). Regarding Hume's discussion on hope and fear, Kemp Smith maintains: "having dwelt with loving elaboration in the 122 pages of Book II for the illustration of the mechanism from which the indirect passions arise, Hume employed a single section of some ten pages for the account of the origin of the direct passions, which are occupied merely in showing that hope and fear are complex, not simple" (*The Philosophy of David Hume*, Palgrave, Macmillan, 2005, p.166).

<sup>8</sup> See Jane McIntyre, "Hume's 'new and extraordinary' account of the passions", *The Blackwell Guide to Hume's "Treatise"*, Saul Traiger (ed.), Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2006.

<sup>9</sup> Similar terminologies were used in various ways as means to explain not only the nature or conduct of passions but also the nature or type of objects, circumstances, or even of the character of a person, as "mixed objects", "mixed Character", "confused sensations", "complicated passions", "compound moral goodness", "compound good objects or event", and so forth. While these terminologies were popular in Hume's age, there was apparently no category employed for limited or special mixed affections, nor technical notion of the mixed affections in the history of literature, which Hume could adapt for his discussion. It is indeed only once in Book II, and nowhere else in the *Treatise* nor in his later works, that Hume refers to affections as "the compound passions", while using such terminologies as mix, transfuse, confound, blend, mingle, interchangeably all through his discussion of the passions.

diverse passions derive from the primitive ones, and produced a vast number of lists or categories which differ from each individual.<sup>10</sup> On this view, it would be no surprise if Hume's concern in his discussion of the compound or mixed affections is with the taxonomy of the passions, and to explain the origin of the particular passions as the derivatives of primary passions.

Contrary to this supposition, however, Hume is rather critical about philosophers' enthusiasm for the taxonomy of the passions. He explicitly states that his interest is not to expand the analysis by distinguishing different kinds of primitive affections<sup>11</sup>:

I have confined myself to the examination of hope and fear in their most simple and natural situation, without considering all the variations they may receive from the mixture of different views and reflections. *Terror, consternation, astonishment, anxiety* and other passions of that kind, are nothing but different species and degrees of fear. It is easy to imagine how a different situation of the object, or a different turn of thought, may change even the sensation of a passion; and this may in general account for the particular subdivisions of the other affections, as well as of fear. Love may show itself in the shape of *tenderness, friendship, intimacy, esteem, good-will*, and in many other appearances; which at the bottom are the same affections, and arise from the same causes, though with a small variation, which it is not necessary to give

---

<sup>10</sup> See, Tom L. Bauchamps' detailed references attached in *A Dissertation on the Passions: The natural History of Religion*, Clarendon Press: Oxford, 2009.

<sup>11</sup> Besides Cicero's fourfold typology of the basic passions, the most influential one was Descartes' schema of six primitive passions, viz. wonder, love, hatred, desire, joy, sadness, from which all other passions were claimed to be derived either as their compounds or species. Henry Grove, a typical typologist of Hume's age, held, for instance, that all passions are the composition of which the primitive passions is a principal ingredient, and therefore "reducible to these three heads, of *Admiration, Love*, and *Hatred*, which may therefore be stiled the primitive passions". Since Grove's work was published ten years after Hume's *Treatise*, we may learn that a typology of the passions has been pursued persistently since Cicero's age as a cardinal and popular methodology of the analysis of the passions. Hume's list of the particular passions discussed in Book II is known to correspond closely to those lists of works he is likely to have consulted, viz. the lists of Locke, Hobbes, St Thomas Aquinas, Cicero. It is acknowledged that Hume's account was influenced greatly by Malebranche, for whom love and hatred are the basic passions, and other passions are the species of these passions.

any particular account of. It is for this reason I have all along confined myself to the principal passion. (T2.3.9.31; SBN 447-8)

In this passage, Hume makes it clear that his concern is with the principal passions “in their most simple and natural situation”, and not, like other writers, with all the particular subdivisions or variations they may receive from the mixture of different views and reflections. For, although love may show itself in various shapes or appearances,<sup>12</sup> it is not important to account for their small variations since we can easily imagine how a different situation of the object, or a different turn of thought, may change even the sensation of the passion. The ultimate object of philosophy is, he says, not to give precise definitions or conceptual conditions of specific passions, but to show “that, in the production and conduct of the passions, there is certain regular mechanism, which is susceptible of as accurate a disquisition, as the laws of motion, optics, hydrostatics, or any part of natural philosophy” (DP 29).<sup>13</sup> It is clear that Hume’s concern in accounting for the origin of the passions is to explain a “regular mechanism” of the production and conduct of the passions in terms of the general law or principle, viz. association. On this view, when he argues that pity or malice arises from a mixture of love or hatred with other affections, his point is that the production of the passion as the mixture of the indirect and the direct passions is the effect of the corroboration of the two kinds of associative principle relevant to the two kinds of passions, viz. the double association of impressions and ideas, and the association of passions. Or, again, when he insists that “hope and fear arise from the different mixture of these opposite passions of grief and joy” from the contrary views

---

<sup>12</sup> Love and hatred were explored by many earlier writers as the primary affections from which other affections are derived. Pride (or self-esteem) and humility were also among the popular topics discussed by philosophers, e.g. Descartes, Hobbs, Spinoza. Malebranche spends a large portion of his book, *The Fable of the Bees*, discussing pride, and also shame.

<sup>13</sup> This position keeps him clear from the unnecessary commitment to the traditional controversy of whether the passions are to be taken as purely passive features of human nature, or as active states of mind which include cognition. Many writers, e. g. Aristotle, Stoics, Spinoza, were preoccupied with the discussion of the nature of the passions, and with precise definitions or conceptual conditions of specific passions, questioning whether the passions are purely passive features of human nature, whether a particular passion involves any particular consideration or active responses to objects apprehended, and so on. By defining the passions as “simple and uniform impressions”, Hume successfully avoided the involvement of this traditional issue.

of the imagination (T2.3.9.16; SBN 443), his focus in his account of the origin of hope and fear is on the vivacity of the imagination, or on the influence of belief in exciting affections.

Hume shows a concern with the difficulty involved in explaining these ingredients which are capable of uniting with love and hatred, and finds it necessary to show that this difficulty “is nowise contrary to my system, but only departs a little from that simplicity which has been hitherto its principal force and beauty” (T2.2.6.2; SBN 366-7). In his discussion of hope and fear he also tries to explain why the very same event gives rise to contrary passions, using the hypothesis he has established in his foregoing discussion. Thus, there seems sufficient reason to suppose that Hume's treatment of the compound and mixed passions is intended chiefly as an account of the origin of the particular passions by the general principle, and to show the consistency of his system. Besides this or other aspects, I argue, Hume's discussion of these passions illustrates the unity of his system. On the one hand his account of the production of the compound passions demonstrates how the two kinds of passions, direct and indirect, are connected together, and on the other his account of hope or fear shows the connection between the two systems of the mind, of ideas and of the passions, in terms of a close unity of the imagination and affections.<sup>14</sup>

Before entering into my discussion, it may be useful to see a contrast between Hume's treatments of the compound and mixed passions. In the first place at Section 7-11 of Part 2 of Book 2, Hume discusses such passions as are the mixture of the indirect and the direct passions. These two kinds of passions are distinct from each other not only by their origin but also by their function: the direct passions are mostly motives by themselves, whereas the indirect are “pure sensations, without

---

<sup>14</sup> Hume's concern in the last five sections in which he explains the will in terms of the causes of the violent passions is to establish that the “vivacity [of belief] is a requisite circumstance to the exciting all our passions” (T2.3.6.10; SBN 427) and to show “the imagination and affections have a close union together, and that nothing, which affects the former, can be entirely indifferent to the latter” (T2.3.6.1; SBN 424).

any direction or tendency to action” (T2.2.9.2; SBN 382). Since Hume has divided the passions into two kinds, direct and indirect, by inventing a new division of ‘indirect’,<sup>15</sup> he needs to show how this connection of the two kinds of passions is possible in order to unify his system. This task is pursued by him in terms of a complicated process of the production of the compound passions, through the illustration of how the effect of sympathy is confounded with love and hatred by being mediated by benevolence or pity. What makes this productive process remarkable is the fact that those passions which proceed from a mixture of the direct and the indirect passions function as motives even though they are themselves indirect passions.

In the second place at Section 9 of Part 3 of Book II, Hume explains the origin of the direct passions, viz. hope, fear, which arise from a mixture of the contrary or adverse passions of the same kind, viz. joy and sorrow. By arguing that the mixed passions arise when joy and grief are “intermingled” with each other according as the imagination changes its view of the object, Hume emphasizes the effect of the influence of belief on the passions, and observes: “The influence of the relations of ideas is plainly seen in this whole affair”(T2.3.9.17; SBN 443).

## 2 The compound passions

Hume begins his discussion of love and hatred in Part 2 of Book II of the *Treatise* with his claim that this set of the indirect passions has a great a resemblance with the other set, viz. pride and humility, and that all the observations which he has formed concerning the latter set of passions are equally applicable to the former. The first half of his treatment of love and hatred is thus spent for the confirmation of his hypothesis which he has established regarding pride and humility, and to establish that “it is by means of a transition arising from a double relation of impressions and ideas, pride

---

<sup>15</sup> Jane McIntyre, by pointing out that the category of the indirect passions is Hume’s invention, writes that “neither this terminology nor any equivalent classification occurs in earlier or contemporary works on the passions”, (“Hume’s passions: Direct and Indirect”, *Hume Studies* 17, Number 1, April 2000, p.88, 81). Rachel Cohon also points out: “Although there are elements of Hume’s view that reflect the thought of others, he is, to my knowledge, the only philosopher to draw a distinction between direct and indirect passions, and to feature these four emotions [viz. pride and humility, love and hatred] together in prominent, symmetrical roles in “Hume’s indirect passions”, *A Companion to Hume*, ed. Elizabeth Radcliffe, Blackwell, 2008, p.160.



and humility, love and hatred are produced" (T2.2.2.28; SBN 347).

Proceeding to discuss the second half of Part 2, Hume stresses the difference between love/hatred and pride/humility, by claiming that the former set of affections is distinct from the latter in that, unlike the latter, the former set of passions "are always followed by, or rather conjoin'd with benevolence and anger" (T2.2.6.3; SBN 367). Although "pride and humility are pure emotions in the soul, unattended with any desire, and not immediately exciting us to action", he insists, "love and hatred are not completed within themselves, nor rest in that emotion which they produce, but carry the mind to something further"(ibid.). Here lies the reason, according to him, why a mixture of different kinds of affections takes place "only in such affections as are attended with a certain appetite or desire; such as those of love and hatred" (T2.2.9.2; SBN 382), but not in those which "are only pure sensations, without any direction or tendency to action"(ibid.). For, since "'tis not the present sensation alone or momentary pain or pleasure, which determines the character of any passion, but the whole bent or tendency of it from the beginning to the end" (ibid.), "[o]ne impression may be related to another, not only when their sensations are resembling...but also when their impulses or direction are similar and correspondent" (ibid.). Although we have all along supposed in the preceding cases with the principal indirect passions that, in order to cause a transition of passions, there is required a double relation of impressions and ideas, we may here learn that a mere resemblance of the direction or tendency of a passion is sufficient to produce a passion. To be precise, the compound passions are produced when the effects of the double association of impressions and ideas involves this peculiar relation of impressions, called a "principle of a parallel direction" (T2.2.9.9; SBN 384). This is Hume's explanation why the compound passions are only those passions which proceed from a mixture of love and hatred, but not from a mixture of pride and humility, with other affections.<sup>16</sup>

On Hume's account, the only tie which connects the indirect and the direct passions

---

<sup>16</sup> But it does not follow that there are no compound passions which contain pride and humility in their ingredients. Hume's assertion that "there is a mixture of pride in contempt, and of humility in respect" (T2.2.10.3; SBN 390), however, is meant to insist that his contempt and respect are species of love and hatred, with which pride or humility is confounded according to the light in which we survey others.

with each other is the natural connection between love/hatred and benevolence/anger. While emphasizing this conjunction between the two sets of affections to be “*original* and primary” (T2.2.9.4; SBN 382), Hume warns us against this possible misunderstanding that “love is nothing but the desire of happiness to another person, and hatred that of misery”, or that “[t]he desire and aversion constitute the very nature of love and hatred” (T2.2.6.4; SBN 367). He insists that this misunderstanding is evidently contrary to experience, which proves that “these desires are not the same with love and hatred, nor make any essential part of them” (T2.2.6.5; SBN 368). By claiming that “benevolence and anger are passions different from love and hatred, and only conjoin’d with them, by the original constitution of the mind” (T2.2.6.6; SBN 368), he explains the origin of the compound passions by appealing not only to the connection but also to the distinction by which benevolence/anger and love/hatred are related with each other.

Since the compound passions are a mixture of love and hatred with other affections, they are indirect,<sup>17</sup> even though motivating unlike other indirect passions.<sup>18</sup> In the opening section of Book II, we may remember, they are enumerated among the indirect passions. But some commentators hesitate to take them to be the indirect passions, and treat them as the direct,<sup>19</sup> by listing them together with benevolence and anger. David Norton in the Editor’s Introduction to the *Treatise*, for example, treats these eight affections as Hume’s compound passions: benevolence, anger, pity, malice, envy, respect, contempt, the amorous passions.<sup>20</sup> It is plain, however, that benevolence

---

<sup>17</sup> Hume says that “as esteem and contempt are to be consider’d as species of love and hatred” (T2.2.5.1; SBN 357). Esteem and contempt are identical with respect and contempt, which he treats in his discussion of the compound passions.

<sup>18</sup> On Hume’s account, the indirect passions are by themselves “only pure emotions in the soul, without any direction or tendency to action” (T2.2.9.2; SBN 382). But unlike pride and humility which “are only pure sensations in the soul, unattended any desire, and not immediately exciting us to action”, “love and hatred are not completed within themselves, nor rest in that emotion which they produce, but carry the mind to something further”, because “they are always followed by, or rather conjoin’d with benevolence and anger” (T2.2.2.3; SBN 367).

<sup>19</sup> Rachel Cohon, for instance, seems to take the compound passions as direct, when she writes that Hume “never offers an example in which any indirect passions is itself the proximal cause of action”, “Hume’s moral sentiments as motives”, op.cit. p.201. Rico Vitz also regards them as direct in “The limit of benevolence”, *Hume Studies*, Vol.28, No.2, p.271-295.

<sup>20</sup> David Norton, op.cit.p.160.

and anger are not be included into Hume's list of the compound passions, though they are the ingredients which compose the compound passions. Although Hume stresses the resemblance between pity/malice and benevolence/anger, by claiming that "pity is a desire of happiness to another, and aversion to his misery, as malice is the contrary appetite" (T2.2.9.3; SBN 382), he makes their difference clear from the outset of his discussion describing them as "the same desires arising from different principles" (T2.2.9.4; SBN 383). Their distinction is fundamental in Hume's system, because the first set (pity/malice) are "secondary ones, arising from original affections" (T2.2.7.1; SBN 369) whereas the second (benevolence/anger) are "arbitrary and original instinct[s] implanted in our nature" (T2.2.7.1; SBN 368): the former indirect whereas the latter direct.

Hume's account of the origin of the compound passions is constituted of two processes, in which "the first foundations" of the passions are established by sympathy, and in which other affections are confounded with these first foundations. Hume's first business is to explain the connection of the two processes, and to show how other passions are confounded with the first foundations to make a mixture as pity, malice, and envy. His second business is to explain how "this mixture takes place only in some cases, and appears not on every occasion" (T2.2.10.5; SBN 391) through the account of respect and contempt in terms of the connection between the imagination and affections.

It is sympathy that provides the first foundations of the compound passions. Hume easily establishes the first foundations in terms of sympathy as he has already explained in his preceding discussion how the persons, interests, passions, or pains and pleasures of all human creatures "strike upon us in a lively manner, and produce an emotion similar to the original one, since a lively idea is easily converted into an impression" (T2.2.7.2; SBN 369). But we may here ask what could be the role of the first foundations in the production of the compound passions. In order to answer this question, we need to recall his former account of the origin of pride and humility, love and hatred, and to reflect that Hume's theory of the origin of these principal indirect passions depends on this "situation of the mind" (T2.2.11.6; SBN 396): although the mind "has certain organs naturally fitted to produce a passion; that passion, when produc'd, naturally turns the view to a certain object", "this not being sufficient to

produce the passion, there is require'd some other emotion, which, by a double relation of impressions and ideas, may set these principles in action, and bestow on them their first impulse" (ibid.). Since the compound affections are the indirect passions, we have reason to suppose that their origin depends on the same situation of the mind, and to assume that "there is require'd some other emotion" in order to give the first motion to the organs which are disposed to produced the passion. The first foundation of the compound passions must then be this "some other emotion", which is supposed to set these principles in action, and bestow on them their first impulse. Pity and malice thus depends on the sympathized emotions communicated from others, or rather on the quality of human nature to receive by communication the inclinations and sentiments of others. When I see my friend grieving over his failure, what pulls the trigger of the affective mechanism of pity is the idea of my friend's grief, which is immediately converted into the very impression it represents (T2.1.11.8; SBN 319),<sup>21</sup> and functions as the first foundations of pity.

But there is a difficulty applying this account of the first foundations of pity to malice or envy, because, when I feel malice at my friend's failure, or envy at his success, for instance, the first foundations of the passion should be joy for malice, or pain for envy. But what I am supposed to feel as the effect of sympathy with my friend's failure is pain, not pleasure, or the effect of sympathy with my friend's success is joy, not pain. Hume solves this difficulty in terms of this property of human nature: "*objects appear greater or less by a comparison with others*", because "an object makes us always receive from another, to which it is compared, a sensation contrary to what arises from itself in its direct and immediate survey" (T2.2.8.7-9; SBN 375).<sup>22</sup> He establishes this "new discovery of an impression" as "the principle of comparison" to

---

<sup>21</sup> He has established in his discussion on sympathy this issue: "When I see the effects of passion in the voice and gesture of any person, my mind immediately passes from these effects to their causes, and forms such a lively idea of the passions as is presently converted into the passion itself" (T3.3.1.7; SBN 576).

<sup>22</sup> Hume gives a detailed explanation of this situation, and concludes that "objects appear greater or less by a comparison with others" is derived from this general maxim: "Every object is attended with some emotion proportioned to it; a great object with a great emotion, a small object with a small emotion" (T2.2.8.6; SBN 374). This is the "original quality" quality of human nature, which is found even in such a physical phenomenon as heating one hand and cooling the other, in which the same water will at the same time seem both hot and cold (T2.2.8.7; SBN 375).

this effect: "The direct survey of another's pleasure naturally gives us pleasure, and therefore produces pain when compared with our own"(ibid.). Although this principle has an effect contrary to sympathy, it is nothing but a variation of sympathy, as we need to receive the affection of others by sympathy in order to compare it to our own, and to experience an affection contrary to the original one as its consequence.<sup>23</sup> Thus the first foundations of the affections of pity and malice are the effects of sympathy in this way: "When our fancy considers directly the sentiments of others, and enters deep into them, it makes us sensible of all the passions it surveys, but in a particular manner of grief or sorrow. On the contrary, when we compare the sentiments of others to our own, we feel a sensation directly opposite to the original one, viz. a joy from the grief of others, and a grief from their joy"(T2.2.9.1; SBN 381).

Hume now discusses the second process in which the foundations of pity or malice are confounded with other affections, viz. pity with grief, malice with joy. Hume's difficulty is that, when I feel pity or malice at the grief of my friend's misery, a mixture of love or tenderness with pity, and of hatred or anger with malice seems contradictory to Hume's system. For, if one impression may be related to another when their sensations are resembling as we have all along supposed in the preceding cases, "as pity is an uneasiness, and malice, a joy, arising from the misery of others, pity should naturally, as in all other cases, produce hatred, and malice love" (ibid.). Hume reconciles this seeming contradiction by pointing out that "'tis not the present sensation alone or momentary pain or pleasure, which determines the character of any passion, but the whole bent or tendency of it from the beginning to the end" (T2.2.9.2; SBN 381). Pity is related to benevolence, and malice to anger by this principle of a parallel direction, as they are "the same desires arising from different principles"(T2.2.9.4; SBN 382). On Hume's account, pity is "a desire of happiness to another, and aversion to his misery, as malice is the contrary appetite" (T2.4.9.3; SBN 382), and "benevolence, or the appetite which attends love, is a desire of the happiness of the person beloved, as anger, or the appetite which attends hatred, is a desire of the misery of the person hated, and an aversion to his happiness"(ibid.). This is how

---

<sup>23</sup> Annette C. Baier seems to make the similar point when she suggests that "'comparison' is seen to presuppose our capacity for sympathy" in *A Progress of Sentiments*, Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, 1994, p.150.

“pity and benevolence, and malice and anger, thus being the same desires arising from different principles, should so totally mix together as to be undistinguishable” (T2.2.9.3; SBN 382).

This is not, however, the whole story about the origin of pity and malice. For, the production of pity or malice depends not only on the connection between pity and benevolence, or malice and anger, but also on the original conjunction by which benevolence is connected with love, or anger with hatred. In short, pity is connected with love, malice with hatred, by being mediated by benevolence or anger. “’Tis by this chain” by which “the passions of pity and malice are connected with love and hatred”(ibid.) that “pity or a sympathy with pain produces love” (T2.2.9.11; SBN 385), or that pity has “the same influence with love and benevolence”(ibid.).

It is often complained that Hume “showed little interest in the possibility of sympathetic feeling as a motive for action”.<sup>24</sup> Although the effect of sympathy itself is not motivating or “non-practical”<sup>25</sup> on Hume’s account, sympathy has no despicable influence on the will and action by giving rise to pity or malice when it involves benevolence or anger. As Hume says that pity or malice “counterfeits” or “imitates” benevolence or anger,<sup>26</sup> pity and malice are motivating in spite of their being the indirect passions, precisely because their ingredients include benevolence and anger.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> E.g. Philip Mercer, p.98.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid. p.45.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

<sup>27</sup> On the basis of this reasoning, Hume explains “why sympathy in uneasiness ever produce any passion beside good-will and kindness” (ibid.), or why this takes place only in one case, but not in others. When a sympathy with uneasiness is “weak”, it produces hatred or contempt by the resemblance of their sensations, as it fails to involve benevolence by the principle of a parallel direction (T2.2.9.12; SBN 385). When a sympathy is “strong”, it is extended so as to produce love or tenderness by the principle of a parallel direction. In order to understand why this difference happens, we need to reflect that sympathy is “nothing but a lively idea converted into an impression”, which depends on the vivacity of the conception with which we enter into and partake of the pleasure or pain of the other person (T2.2.9.13; SBN 385). According to Hume, when another’s misery is presented in a feeble manner, the feeble impression I receive by communication is not sufficient to make me so much interested as to concern myself in his good fortune as well as his bad, causing no extensive sympathy, nor the passions related to it (T2.2.9.14; SBN 386). A weak impression that is painful, when communicated by sympathy, is related to anger and hatred by the resemblance of sensations, so that hatred or contempt arises from a small

By demonstrating how the mixture of love and hatred with benevolence and anger could give rise to pity and malice, Hume offers an example in which the indirect passions become the proximal causes of action by an inclusion of the direct passions.<sup>28</sup> To put it the other way round, the production of the compound passions may be taken to be an evident proof of the connection of the indirect and the direct passions. In this respect, the importance of Hume's account of the compound passions cannot be overstated.

After having explained how the compound passions proceed from a mixture of love with other affections in his account of pity and malice, and envy, Hume proceeds to explain in his discussion of respect and contempt "why this mixture takes place only in some cases, and appears not on every occasion" (T2.2.10.5; SBN 391) through the demonstration of how "these affections arise from the imagination, according to the light in which it places its object" (T2.2.9.2; SBN 381). His discussion of the origin of respect and contempt is meant to show how a mixture of the two kinds of passions depends on the vivacity of the imagination, or on the influence of belief on affections.

### 3 Hume's treatment of hope and fear

Hume begins his discussion of the mixed affections of hope and fear at Section 9 of Part 3 by reiterating his former definition of the direct passions in this way: "The impressions which arise from good or evil most naturally, and with the least preparation, are the *direct* passions of desire and aversion, grief and joy, hope and fear, along with volition" (T2.3.9.2; SBN 438). But why was it necessary for him to repeat the same definition which he has given in the opening section of Book II? The answer

---

degree, or one weakly sympathized with. By contrast, a strong impression, when communicated, gives a double tendency of the passions, which is related to benevolence and love by a similarity of direction, however painful the first impression might have been. As the extensive or limited sympathy depends upon the force of the first sympathy, benevolence arises from a great degree of misery, or any degree strongly sympathized with. This is how the same object causes contrary passions according to the different degrees with which it is sympathized.

<sup>28</sup> It is often considered that on Hume's account no indirect passion is motivating. Cohon writes, for instance: Hume "never offers an example in which any indirect passion is itself the proximal cause of action. This strongly suggests that Hume thinks no indirect passion is itself motive." ("Hume's moral sentiments as motives", op.cit. p.201.)

to this question seems to be found in the following two details additional to the present definition.

First, Hume adds “volition” to the present list of the direct passions in spite of his former assertion that the will is not, properly speaking, comprehended among the passions.<sup>29</sup> By including volition in the direct passions, he perhaps wants to emphasize that the will cannot be discussed separately, as he had made clear by titling this part “The will and direct passions”. Hume frequently mentions the will and passions together,<sup>30</sup> not only because the will is the most immediate effect of pain and pleasure (T2.3.1.2; SBN 399) but also because most of the direct passions are motives by themselves.

Secondly, Hume gives this limitation to the definition of the direct passions by claiming: “Besides good and evil, or in other words, pain and pleasure, the direct passions frequently arise from a natural impulse or instinct, which is perfectly unaccountable” (T2.3.9.8; SBN 439). All through the foregoing discussion, we are led to believe that the passions are secondary or reflective as they arise from good or evil, or pain or pleasure. But we now find in the present discussion that there are those passions which are not subject to this definition. We here learn that the direct passions are two kinds: those which arise from good and evil, and those which “produce good and evil, and proceed not from them”(ibid.). Among the second instinctive passions, Hume counts “desire of punishment to our enemies, and of happiness to our friend; hunger, lust, and a few other bodily appetites”(ibid.).<sup>31</sup> It is the first kind of passions that forms the subject of his succeeding discussion on fear and hope, and curiosity, whereas the second kind was discussed in the preceding discussion in terms of “certain instincts originally implanted in our natures”, viz. “benevolence, and

---

<sup>29</sup> “Of all the immediate effects of pain and pleasure, there is none more remarkable than the will; and though, properly speaking, it be not comprehended among the passions, yet, as the full understanding of its nature and properties is necessary to the explanation of them, we shall here make it the subject of our inquiry” (T2.3.1.2; SBN 399).

<sup>30</sup> T2.3.7.3; SBN 428, T2.3.7.4; SBN 429, T2.3.7.8; SBN 431, for instance.

<sup>31</sup> Kemp Smith re-classified Hume’s classification of the passions, by including these “sheerly instinctive passions” into a new, or additional, category of what he names the ‘primary’ passions’, and all other affections into the ‘secondary’ passions. (Norman Kemp Smith, *The Philosophy of David Hume*, New York, 1941).



resentment, the love of life, and kindness to children; or the general appetite to good, and aversion to evil, considered merely as such" (T2.3.3.8; SBN 417). We may infer that Hume rehearses the definition of the direct passions in order to show that those direct passions which he is treating in the succeeding discussion are distinct from those instinctive ones, or "the calm passions", which he has treated in the foregoing sections.

Before entering into the discussion of the first kind of passions, Hume gives an overview of the seven principal direct passions which he has enumerated in the list of the direct passions, viz. desire, aversion, grief, joy, hope, fear, volition. He describes briefly how they are related to each other:

When good is certain or probable, it produces *joy*. When evil is in the same situation, there arises *grief or sorrow*.

When either good or evil is uncertain, it gives rise to *fear* or *hope*, according to the degrees of uncertainty on the one side or the other.

*Desire* arises from good consider'd simply; and *aversion* is deriv'd from evil. The *will* exerts itself, when either the good or absence of the evil may be attained by any action of the mind or body. (T2.3.9.5-7; SBN 439)

This overview may be taken to be a manifesto in which Hume makes the following three points clear. First, he shares Hutcheson's view that the production of motivating passions depends on our apprehension of good or evil to be possible or attainable, but, secondly, he departs from Hutcheson in understanding the relation between the will and desires. Thirdly, he shows how the succeeding account of the origin of hope, fear, and curiosity is related to his preceding discussion of the will and direct passions.

Hume's strategy for the first point is to draw the particular passions and their surrounding circumstances from Hutcheson's account, and to rehearse it with almost no essential alteration. It is observable how Hume echoes in the above overview of joy and sorrow Hutcheson's account that "The Reflection upon the Presence or certain Futurity of any Good, raises the Sensation of Joy"; "The Reflection upon the Presence of Evil, or the certain Prospect of it, or of the Loss of Good, is the Occasion

of the Sensation of Sorrow”.<sup>32</sup> This adaptation from Hutcheson, who was a well-known philosopher in Hume’s age, may have been useful for Hume to appeal to his readers that his account is founded on the standpoint common to Hutcheson’s on the one hand, and to show his originality by making it clear in what respect his account differs from Hutcheson’s.

Again in describing desire and aversion in the above overview, Hume assimilates a lot from this account of Hutcheson’s: “The Apprehension of Good, either to ourselves or others, as attainable, raises *Desire*. The like Apprehension of Evil, or of the Loss of Good, raises *Aversion*, or Desire of removing or preventing it”.<sup>33</sup> By this deliberate assimilation, Hume successfully highlights this difference: although on Hutcheson’s account desire arises when good is attainable, it is not desire but the will, according to Hume, that arises when good is attainable. This difference between Hume and Hutcheson is the reflection of the different standpoints which they hold regarding the relation between the will and desires.

In Hutcheson’s system it is only desire and aversion that can “directly lead to Action”. On his account, the mere presence of these two passions is sufficient to move

---

<sup>32</sup> Francis Hutcheson, *An Essay on the Nature and Conduct of the Passions and Affections, with illustrations on the Moral Sense*, ed. Aaron Garrett, (Indiana police: Library Fund, 2002) p.51. On Hutcheson’s account, joy and sorrow are “spiritual or pure affections”, and distinct from other affections as they do not include any desires like other affections (p.50). Besides, joy and sorrow, together with desire and aversion, are alone the immediate effects of the apprehension of good or evil, as they are the subdivided affections of love and hatred, which are the original and primary affections derived from good and evil.

<sup>33</sup> Hutcheson, *ibid.* p.50. Hume seems to adapt wittingly Hutcheson’s account in writing this overview. It may not be an exaggeration to suggest that Hume’s overview is a copy of Hutcheson’s account that joy, desire, or sorrow arises in correspondence respectively to these different circumstances, viz. good objects are present/ certain, doubtfully expected, or lost. Hutcheson writes: “Good Objects excite *Love*, evil Objects *Hatred*: each of these is subdivided, as the Object is *present* and *certain*, or *doubtfully expected*, or *certainly removed*. To these three Circumstances correspond three Modifications of the original Affections: viz. *joy*, *Desire* and *Sorrow*. Good present, raises Joy of Love, or *Love of Joy*: Good in suspense, the *Love of Desire*: Good Lost, *Love of Sorrow*. Evil present raises *Aversion of Sorrow*: Evil expected, *Aversion* or *Hatred of Desire*: and Evil removed, *Aversion of Joy*. The *Joy of Love*, and the Joy of Hatred, will possibly be found nearly the same sort of Sensations, tho upon different Occasions: the same may be said of the *Sorrow of Aversion* and thus this Division will amount to the same with that of the Stoicks” (*ibid.* p.50). This is the division adapted from Malebranche, according to Hutcheson.

us to act, and therefore motivation is a matter of the inclusion of desire or aversion, which can be contained in all sensation except in joy and sorrow.<sup>34</sup> Hutcheson thus argues: “MIXED *Objects* are pursued or shunned with Desire or Aversion, proportioned to the apprehended Excess of Good or Evil...A COMPOUND *good or evil Object* is prosecuted or shunned with a Degree of Desire or Aversion, proportioned to the Sum of Good, or of Evil”.<sup>35</sup> Hutcheson's concern is thus with the question, how affections are influenced by the quantity, degree, or ratio of good or evil contained in the objects, and to establish this “general law”, that “the Strength of publick Desire is in a Compound Ratio of the Quantity of the Good itself, and the Number, Attachment, and Dignity of the Persons”.<sup>36</sup> Hutcheson's *Essay on the Nature and Conduct of the Passions and Affections* is intended to explain “the best management of our Desire” or “the proper and effectual means” in order to obtain the greatest good for ourselves or others.

By contrast, Book II of the *Treatise* is not intended to explain how to attain “strength of mind”. For, on in Hume's account, strength of mind is nothing but “the prevalence of the calm passions above the violent”, which is principally a matter of “the *general* character or *present* disposition of the person” (T2.3.3.10; SBN T418). Hume does not mean, however, that our action is entirely subject to the peculiar temper and disposition of every individual. We have an influence on the will and action to a certain extent,<sup>37</sup> Hume insists, since motivation is not merely a matter of the presence

---

<sup>34</sup> It seems possible that a similar function is assigned by Hume to the direct passions of benevolence and anger, as we have seen in his discussion of the compound passions, viz. pity, malice.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid. p.37. Although these two expressions, “compound” and “mix”, have been used in general interchangeably in literature on the passions as I have noted above, Hutcheson seems to employ them differently: by the former he means those of a mixed nature, which contain something adverse and something prosperous in their different circumstances, whereas by the latter, those which contain varieties of the same kind, viz. several Goods, at once. Hume seems to adapt this different use of the two expressions only to some extent.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid. p.39.

<sup>37</sup> Hume assumes “’tis certain, that when we wou'd govern a man, and push him to any action, 'twill commonly be better policy to work upon the violent than the calm passions, and rather take him by his inclination than what is vulgarly call'd his *reason*”, because we may observe, that all depends upon the situation of the object, and that a variation in this particular will be able to change the calm and the violent passions into each other” (T2.3.4.1; SBN T419).

of motivating passions. It is certain that “when we wou’d govern a man, and push him to any action, ’twill commonly be better policy to work upon the violent than the calm passions”(T2.3.4.1; SBN T419). In other words, by placing the object in such particular situations as are proper to increase the violence of the passion”(ibid.), we can control our own action or that of others. It is because motivation is more or less a matter of “the impulse of action”. Hume’s final task in Book II is to explain this impulse of action, which depends on physical, mental, and social relations between ourselves and the object. The five sections of T2.3.4-8 of Book II are thus spent illustrating these relations in terms of those “those circumstances and situations of objects, which render a passion either calm or violent” (T2.3.4.1; SBN T419).

We might find Hume’s account of hope and fear to be almost a repeat of Hutcheson’s, as he analyzes the same particular passions by the same methodology arguing that “the very same event, which, by its certainty, would produce grief or joy, gives always rise to fear or hope, when only probable and uncertain” (T2.3.9.9; SBN 439-440). For, Hutcheson maintains: “Fear ... is ‘a Mixture of *Sorrow and Aversion*, when we apprehend the Probability of Evil, or the Loss of Good befalling our selves, or those we love’: There is more or less of Sorrow, according to the apprehended Degrees of Probability. Hope ... is ‘a Mixture of *Desire and Joy*, upon the probability of obtaining Good, and avoiding Evil’”.<sup>38</sup> But in spite of their similarity, they differ in that, although on Hutcheson’s account, hope is nothing but joy plus desire, whereas fear sorrow plus aversion, pn Hume’s, hope and fear are a mixture of both joy and sorrow, containing both affections for their ingredients, only differing in the degree of their composition. For, since for Hutcheson joy and sorrow are “spiritual or pure Affections”,<sup>39</sup> they become motivating by being mixed with desire and aversion respectively. Hutcheson’s concern is therefore to explain how these passions could be motivating in terms of the conjunction with desire and aversion which depends on the ratio of good or evil contained in the object, or on “the probability of obtaining Good, and avoiding Evil”. Hume departs from Hutcheson by contending that “hope and fear arise from the

---

<sup>38</sup> Hutcheson, op.cit. p.53.

<sup>39</sup> Following Malebranche, Hutcheson calls these four “original Affections”, viz. Desire, Aversion, Joy and Sorrow, “spiritual or pure Affections”, and distinguishes them from Passions, which are “violent confused Sensations, connected, with bodily Motions” (Hutcheson, op.cit.p.50-1).

different mixture of these opposite passions of grief and joy, and from their imperfect union and conjunction" (T2.3.9.16; SBN 442). For, Hume's concern in his discussion of hope and fear is to explain the origin of these passions, and to establish that hope or fear are mixtures of both joy and sorrow, constituted of the same ingredients, differing only in mixing ratio of these two ingredients. But if Hume's account of hope and fear is not intended for the demonstration of "the best management of our Desire" or "the proper and effectual means" to obtain the greatest good for ourselves or others, what is it intended for, then?

When accounting for the production of hope and fear in terms of a mixture of joy and sorrow, Hume refers back to what he has advanced on the nature of probability in Book I, by reciting: "probability arises from an opposition of contrary chances or causes, by which the mind is not allowed to fix on either side, but is incessantly tossed from one to another, and at one moment is determined to consider an object as existent, and at another moment as the contrary" (T2.3.9.10; SBN 440). The union of the opposite passions happens when the object, concerning whose reality we are doubtful, is the object either of desire or aversion, because, he reasons, "according as the mind turns itself either to the one side or the other, it must feel a momentary impression of joy or sorrow" (T2.3.9.12; SBN 440), which are united and intermingled with each other. In this case, he argues, the unity of these contrary passions produced by the contrary views of the imagination takes place in three different ways.

In the first case, the mind is kept in a state of indifference, because when the contrary passions arise from objects entirely different from each other, "they take place alternately, the want of relation in the ideas separating the impressions from each other, and preventing their opposition" (T2.3.9.14; SBN 442). In the second case, the mind is kept in perfect tranquility, because when the same event is of a mixed nature, and contains something adverse and something prosperous in its different circumstances, "both the passions, mingling with each other by means of the relation, become mutually destructive" (*ibid.*). In the third case, where "the object is not a compound of good or evil, but is considered as probable or improbable in any degree", "the contrary passions will both of them be present at once in the soul, and, instead of destroying and tempering each other, will subsist together, and produce a third impression or affection by their union" (T2.3.9.16; SBN 442). Hope and fear arise in the third case, he says, from the

different mixture of these opposite passions, grief and joy, and from their imperfect union and conjunction (T2.3.9.15; SBN 443), which takes place in the following way.<sup>40</sup>

In the case of probability, the contrary chances are so far related that they determine concerning the existence or non-existence of the same object. But this relation is far from being perfect; since some of the chances lie on the side of existence, and others on that of non-existence, which are objects altogether incompatible. 'Tis impossible, by one steady view, to survey the opposite chances, and the events dependent on them; but 'tis necessary that the imagination should run alternately from the one to the other. Each view of the imagination produces its peculiar passion, which decays away by degrees, and is follow'd by a sensible vibration after the stroke. The incompatibility of the views keeps the passions from shocking in a direct line, if that expression may be allow'd; and yet their relation is sufficient to mingle their fainter emotions. 'Tis after this manner that hope and fear arise from the different mixture of these opposite passions of grief and joy, and from their imperfect union and conjunction. (T2.3.9.16; SBN 442)

In this passage, we can clearly see how emphatic Hume's account is concerning the close union of the imagination and affections: he stresses that, when the imagination runs alternately from the existence and non-existence of the object, each view of the imagination is accompanied with each peculiar passion proportioned to it.<sup>41</sup> Whenever

---

<sup>40</sup> Hume famously explains the mixture of contrary passions by the analogy of two opposite liquors in the following way. "If the objects of the contrary passions be totally different, the passions are like two opposite liquors in different bottles, which have no influence on each other. If the objects be intimately connected, the passions are like an alkali and acid, which, being mingled, destroy each other. If the relation be more imperfect, and consists in the contradictory views of the same object, the passions are like oil and vinegar, which, however mingled, never perfectly unite and incorporate" (T2.3.9.15; SBN 443). This assimilation of the passions to liquor or fluid makes a vivid contrast to his treatment of ideas, which are assimilated to particles or the extension and solidity of matter.

<sup>41</sup> On Hume's view, "no object is presented to the senses, nor image formed in the fancy, but what is accompany'd with some emotion or movement of spirits proportion'd to it" (T2.2.8.4; SBN 373), as he established in his discussion on love.

the imagination varies its view about the object, each view of the imagination produces its peculiar passion, joy or sorrow, according to his maxim, that “every object is attended with some emotion proportion’d to it” (T2.2.8.6; SBN 374). For, “when good is certain or probable, it produces joy”, whereas when “evil is in the same situation, there arises grief or sorrow” (T2.2.9.5; SBN 439) as we have seen in his overview. Although each peculiar affection arises, and decays away by degrees, according as the imagination runs alternately from one to the other, the change in the former cannot catch up with the change in the latter, because “the imagination is extremely quick and agile; but the passions are slow and restive” (T2.3.9.12; SBN 441). Each stroke of the fancy “will not produce a clear and distinct note of passion”, causing instead a mixture of passions, as the passions resemble not “a wind-instrument of music, which in running over all the notes immediately loses the sound after the breath ceases”, but rather “a string-instrument, where, after each stroke, the vibrations still retain some sound, which gradually and insensibly decays”(T2.3.9.12; SBN 440-1), according to him. This is how, according as the probability inclines to good or evil, the passions of joy or sorrow, which predominate in the composition, are intermingled with each other by means of the contrary views of the imagination. “The influence of the relations of ideas is plainly seen in this whole affair” (T2.3.9.20; SBN 444), as he insists: “Contrary passions are not capable of destroying each other, except when their contrary movements exactly rencounter, and are opposite in their directions, as well as in the sensation they produce. This exact rencounter depends upon the relations of those ideas from which they are deriv’d, and is more or less perfect, according to the degrees of the relation” (T2.3.9.16; SBN 442).<sup>42</sup> We may here answer the above question to this effect: Hume’s object in establishing that hope and fear arise from the different mixture of these opposite passions of grief and joy is to confirm “a close union of the imagination and affections” through the demonstration of the influence of belief on the passions.<sup>43</sup> This union is essential to his system as it entails the connection between

---

<sup>42</sup> The similar reasoning is observable in Hutcheson arguing that “EQUAL *Mixtures* of Good and Evil stop all Desire or Aversion”(Hutcheson, op.cit.p.37).

<sup>43</sup> In the foregoing section, “Of the influence of the imagination on the passions”, Hume has established a close union of the imagination and affection by claiming that “the imagination and affections have a close union together, and that nothing, which affects the former, can entirely indifferent to the latter” (T2.3.6.1; SBN 424).

the two systems of the mind, of the understanding and of the passions.

## Conclusion

Hume discusses those six passions which proceed from the compound of love and hatred with other affections, viz. pity, malice, envy, respect, contempt, the amorous passions, in Part 2 of Book II of the *Treatise*, and in Part 3 hope and fear as a mixture of joy and sorrow.<sup>44</sup> Since Hume discusses these two kinds of compound and mixed passions alike after the account of the principal passions by adapting the particular passions as well as their correspondent circumstances from the earlier literature of typology or taxonomy of the passions, we may naturally assume that Hume's interest in discussing these passions is in the classification of the passions. It would indeed be no wonder if Hume, after having established the system by which the principal passions arise, found it necessary to prove the consistency of his hypothesis, and to show that the genesis of those derivative passions which seems contradictory to his system is in fact "nowise contrary to his system, but only departs a little from that simplicity which has been hitherto its principal force and beauty" (T2.2.6.2; SBN 366). We may thus assume that, in the last stage of his treatment of the indirect passions, Hume reinforces his system by showing that the production of the variables of love and

---

<sup>44</sup> The last section of Book II is employed for the discussion of "curiosity, or the love of truth". Hume explains the origin of the love of truth as the effect of a concern, by claiming that in all these activities, philosophy, hunting, gaming, "tis from that concern our satisfaction arises" (T2.3.10.10; SBN 452). While claiming that "the pleasure of study consists chiefly in the action of the mind, and the exercise of the genius, and understanding in the discovery or comprehension of truth", he insists on the necessity of the importance or utility of truth to "fix our attention", but also of "a degree of success in the attainment of the end, or the discovery of that truth we examine" to keep our attention engaged (T2.3.10.6-7; SBN 451). Obviously, Hume's object in this final section is to show the circumstance in which a concern arises, rather than to explain the origin of the passion itself. By claiming it to be "useful on many occasions", he established this "general" thesis: "Though that passion be not derived originally from the end, but merely from the action and pursuit, yet, by the natural course of the affections, we acquire a concern for the end itself, and are uneasy under any disappointment we meet with in the pursuit of it" (T2.3.10.7; SBN 452). "This proceeds from the relation and parallel direction of the passions"(ibid.), according to Hume as the effect of a concern.

Hume then examines curiosity, or "an insatiable desire to know the actions and circumstances of our neighbours" even though we have no concern with their interest. For, unlike the love of truth, this love of knowledge consists neither in the action of the mind nor in the exercise of



hatred is nothing but a variation of what he has established regarding the principal passions, and is a phenomenon in which some different principles operate jointly, e.g. the principle of comparison, the principle of a parallel direction, or by our adherence to general rules. Or, after having explained those direct passions which arise from a natural impulse or instinct, e.g. benevolence and anger, as we suppose, he explains the other kind of direct passions which arise from pain and pleasure. There is indeed sufficient reason to support this understanding of his treatment of these passions in so far as from the very beginning of his discussion of the passions, Hume's utmost concern in Book II is with the consistency of his system, and to show that there is evidently a great analogy betwixt that hypothesis by which he has already explained the system of ideas, and the present one of the passions, and to hold that this "analogy must be allow'd to be no despicable proof of both hypotheses" (T2.1.5.11; SBN 290).

The object my paper is only to suggest that this interpretation should not be taken to imply, that what is intended by Hume in his treatment of these derivative passions is nothing more than the account of the genesis of each particular passion. It is true that Hume's concern in Book II is invariably with the genesis of a passion, and that his analysis of the origin of each particular compound or mixed passion is significant by itself, and "most resourceful" as Laird observes.<sup>45</sup> But we cannot overlook, I argued, that Hume's treatment of these passions has such a crucial aspect as to be

---

genius, and therefore is derived from a quite different principle. Hume finds the circumstance relevant to the production of this passion in that "the influence of belief is at once to enliven and infix any idea in the imagination" (T2.3.10.12; SBN 453). When he insists that "by the vivacity of the idea we interest the fancy, and produce, though in a lesser degree, the same pleasure which arises from a moderate passion" (ibid.), we may here learn that curiosity is meant for a demonstration of an extreme case in which the passion arises even where we have no specific concern: the passion arises *in so far as* we have a lively idea related to a present impression. We may thus infer Hume to stress that belief is sufficient in some case for the production of a passion. Hume makes this point clear by mentioning these two examples: a stranger in a town who acquires curiosity about the inhabitants or its history as he becomes acquainted with it, and reading a history of a nation produces a desire of knowing more of it. The vivacity of ideas is essential to the arousal of our passions, as it enlivens and infixes any idea in the imagination, according to him. There seems justification to suppose that, on leaving his treatment of the passions at the end of Book II, Hume wants to reiterate his cardinal issue that "belief is nothing but a lively idea to a present impression" so that "this vivacity is a requisite circumstance to the exciting all our passions" (T2.3.6.10; SBN 424).

<sup>45</sup> John Laird, *Hume's Philosophy of Human Nature*, Archon Books, 1967, p.200.

the illustration of the unity of his system. In order to highlight this aspect, it would certainly be convenient to bracket these passions together, and treat them as “the compound or mixed passions”, rather than focusing on each particular passion.

Hume divides his treatment of the passions into three parts on the basis of his original division of indirect and direct, and discusses three different subjects, viz. pride and humility, love and hatred, and the will and direct passions, separately. The distinction between the direct and the indirect passions is definite and fundamental, not only because they are distinguished by their origin but also because they function differently. On Hume’s account, the only tie which connects the two kinds of passions is the natural and original conjunction between the two sets of the indirect and the direct passions, viz. love/hatred and benevolence/anger. He is so concerned to establish that the compound passions arise from a mixture of love with other affections when mediated by benevolence and anger, because, I suggested, it is here that he intends to show how the two kinds of passions “arising from different principles, should so totally mix together, as to be undistinguishable” (T2.2.9.4; SBN 392). A production of a new passion here functions as an evident proof of the connection of the direct and the indirect passions, which in turn is a proof of the efficacy of this original connection between love/hatred and benevolence/anger. Hume then proceeds to examine those passions, viz. hope and fear, which are a mixture of joy and sorrow, differing only in their composition of these opposite ingredients. Hume, by arguing that this mixture depends on the imagination, and on the change of its view, which is attended either by joy or sorrow, tries to establish in terms of the production of the passion how the imagination and affections are in a close union together. It then may not be fanciful to suggest that, on leaving the subject of the passions, Hume wants to reiterate the connection between the system of the passions and the system of ideas, and to confirm this central theme announced in his Advertisement: “The subject of the understanding and Passions make a complete chain of reasoning by themselves”.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> This paper is the product of Sapporo University Research Grant, 2013. I should like to express my gratitude to Sapporo University for supporting me to attend the International Hume Conference held in Belo Horizonte, Brazil 2013.